DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 595 TM 010 115

AUTHOR Eglsaer, Richard: Matuszek, Paula
TITLE Project P.A.V.E. Evaluation. Technical Report 1977-78. Publication Number: 77.49.
INSTITUTION Austin Independent School District, Tex. Office of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE 30 Jun 78
NOTE 82p.: Some appendices marginally legible.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement: Attendance: Cocurricular Activities: Educational Assessment: *Experimental Programs: Interinstitutional Cooperation: Parent Participation: *Program Attitudes: Program Effectiveness: Program Planning: *Program Validation: Questionnaires: Senior High Schools: *Special Education: Student Improvement: Vocational Counseling: Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Austin School District TX: *Project PAVE: Texas (Austin)

ABSTRACT

Project PAVE was implemented in Travis High School, Austin, Texas, to extend and coordinate services for certain high school special education students. Four components were crucial to the Project PAVE model: parental involvement, academic achievement, vocational programing, and extracurricular opportunities. The project evaluation, conducted in 1977-78, focused on whether PAVE activities should be disseminated to other school districts and whether PAVE should be adopted by other schools in the Austin Independent School District. The following areas were investigated: (1) special student participation in school activities: (2) attendance and dropout statistics: (3) fulfillment of project objectives: (4) credits earned toward graduation: (5) low-cost activities: (6) staff's time requirements and perceptions of project effectiveness: (7) implementation in other Austin schools: (8) utilization of planning process activities: (9) new types of decision making and involvement of parents, students, and counselors: (10) achievement gains: (11) student participation in vocational activities: and (12) changes in teaching practices and attitudes. (Data pertaining to these questions are summarized, and questionnaires used to collect data are appended). (GDC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Research And Evaluation

ED183595

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OFFICE
OF
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

TM010 115

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Freda M. Holley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

austin independent school district

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Reverend Marvin C. Griffin, President

Jerry Nugent, Vice President

DeCourcy Kelley, Secretary

Nan Clayton

Will D. Davis

M. K. Hage, Jr.

Manuel Navarro

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Dr. Jack L. Davidson

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Dr. Freda M. Holley

TECHNICAL REPORT

1977-78

Project P.A.V.E. Evaluation

June 30, 1978

Richard Eglsaer
Project Evaluator

Paula Matuszek, Ph.D.
Senior Evaluator

Approved: Freda M. Holley

Freda M. Holley, Ph.D.
Director of Research and Evaluation

Publication Number: 77.49

PROGRAM STAFF

The following staff members were responsible for the implementation of Project P.A.V.E.

Jack Allison
Principal Travis High School and
Project Director

Ana M. Hill
Planning/Dissemination Coordinator

Ann Young
Academic Coordinator

David Ross
Vocational/Occupational Coordinator

Linda Cunningham
Secretary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix A . . . . . Planning Conference Data A-1

Appendix B . . . . . Local Support Team Analysis B-1

Appendix C . . . . . Student Transcript Data C-1

Appendix D . . . . . Student Attendance Data D-1

Appendix E . . . . . Staff Questionnaire E-1

Appendix F . . . . . Austin Independent School District Staff Survey F-1

Appendix G . . . . . P.A.V.E. Activities and Verification Documents G-1

Appendix A

PLANNING CONFERENCE DATA

Instrument Description: Planning Conference Data

Brief description of the instrument:

The Planning Conference Data form provided a coding procedure for the planning conferences. One sheet was filled out by the project staff after each planning conference.

To whom was the instrument administered?

The form was used to code planning conferences during the 1977-78 school year.

How many times was the instrument administered?

Once for each student discussed at a planning conference.

When was the instrument administered?

Throughout the 1977-78 school year.

Who administered the instrument?

The evaluator monitored the P.A.V.E.'s staff's compilation of the information.

What training did the administrators have?

General training in instrument and interview administration.

Was the instrument administered under standardized conditions?

No.

Who developed the instrument?

PAVE staff developed the form and the Evaluator from the Office of Research and Evaluation developed the monitoring procedures.

Were there problems with the instrument or the administration that might affect the validity of the data?

No.

What reliability and validity data are available on the instrument?

None.

Are there norm data available for interpreting the results?

No.

PLANNING CONFERENCE DATA

Purpose

The primary purpose of this instrument was to determine the extent to which parents were involved in making long and short range educational plans for their children. The following questions were addressed:

Decision Question 2.0: Should Project P.A.V.E. be adopted by schools of A.I.S.D.?

Evaluation Question 2.5: To what extent are parents, students, and counselors involved in decision making?

2.12: How many parents participate in P.A.V.E. activities (conferences, meetings)?

Procedure

This instrument was developed by the P.A.V.E. staff and monitored by the evaluator. The planning conference form is presented in Figure A-1.

Throughout the 1977-78 school year parents of Travis High School special education students were requested to attend meetings at school regarding educational plans for their children. There were basically two types of meetings: a Planning Conference, and an Individual Educational program (IEP). Planning conferences were held throughout the year. These meetings were attended by the student's special education teacher, a P.A.V.E. staff member, and the parent(s) of the special education student. During these meetings, parents were provided with information concerning the special education services available at Travis. Based upon the parents' input and approval, the goal of these meetings was to arrive at a decision concerning the educational program of the special education student. The IEP was similar to the planning conferences in terms of goals. The IEP meetings differed from the planning conferences insofar as the IEP were group meetings. As a large group, the parents received information about program options at Travis. After the information sharing, parents would meet individually with the special education teachers and Project P.A.V.E. staff to decide upon an educational program for their children.

After each session the minutes of meetings were recorded on the Planning Conference data form by the Project P.A.V.E. staff member. These forms provided information as to whether or not the respective parents participated in the decision making process.

These results were tabulated by hand.

Summary of Results

Forty-five of 64 (70.3%) parents participated in either a planning conference or an IEP meeting. Twenty of 64 (31.2%) parents attended planning conferences whereas 25 of 64 (39.1%) parents attended the IEP meetings. Nineteen of 64 (29.7%) parents did not attend either type of meeting.

Students attended these meetings in two situations (4.4%).

School counselors did not attend either type of meeting.

Figure A-2 presents the attendance rates for these meetings by grade level.

PLANNING CONFERENCE

Student Name:_____ Date:_____

Persons Attending:_____

Vocational Testing:

GATB Results:_____ Date:_____
WRIOT Results:_____ Date:_____
McCarron Dials
Results:_____ Date:_____
SPIB Results:_____ Date:_____

Other:_____

Parent Interest:

Student Interest:

Diploma Plan: VAC (Work Study) _____
Regular _____

Long Range Plans:

Tentative Schedule: (This Year)

1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter

Comments:

Figure A-1: PLANNING CONFERENCE FORM.

Grade Level	Planning Conferences	IEP Meeting	Non-attenders
9th-grade	11 (39.3%)	10 (35.7%)	7 (25.0%)
10th-grade	7 (38.9%)	6 (33.3%)	5 (27.8%)
11th-grade	2 (13.3%)	7 (46.7%)	6 (40.0%)
12th-grade	0 (00.0%)	2 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)
Total	20 (31.2%)	25 (39.1%)	19 (29.7%)

Figure A-2. ATTENDANCE RATES FOR PLANNING CONFERENCES AND IEP MEETINGS BY GRADE LEVEL

Appendix B

L.S.T. ANALYSIS

Instrument Description: L.S.T. Analysis

Brief description of the instrument:

The L.S.T. Analysis form provided a categorical coding procedure for the L.S.T. discussions. One sheet was filled out by the Project P.A.V.E. planning coordinator each time a student was discussed.

To whom was the instrument administered?

The form was used to code L.S.T. meetings during the 1977-78 school year.

How many times was the instrument administered?

Once for each student discussed at each L.S.T. meeting.

When was the instrument administered?

From September, 1977 to May, 1978 at L.S.T. meetings which were held once each week.

Who administered the instrument?

Project P.A.V.E. Planning/Dissemination Coordinator.

What training did the administrators have?

General training in instrument and interview administration.

Was the instrument administered under standardized conditions?

No.

Were there problems with the instrument or the administration that might affect the validity of the data?

No.

Who developed the instrument?

1976-77 Project P.A.V.E. Evaluator from the Office of Research and Evaluation.

What reliability and validity data are available on the instrument?

Inter-rater reliability was established informally.

Are there norm data available for interpreting the results?

No.

L.S.T. ANALYSIS

Purpose

In the fall of 1976, the Project P.A.V.E. Evaluator designed and began administering the L.S.T. Analysis form. This form was designed to summarize the services and decisions for special education students which derived from the L.S.T. On the form are coded: the basis for referral, the changes suggested and those made previously for a student, and the possible processes accounting for a decision (processes include sharing information, availability or lack of program options). The information from this form was used to answer the following questions:

Decision Question 2.0: Should Project P.A.V.E. be adopted by schools of A.I.S.D.?

Evaluation Question 2.4: What kinds of decisions are now made about special education students that were not made before implementation of the Systematic Planning Process?

2.9: What changes in services to students derived from the L.S.T.?

Procedure

The form was pilot tested, to determine rater agreement, in September, 1976, by the Project P.A.V.E. Evaluator and Coordinator. A high degree of agreement led the evaluator to adopt the instrument and continue using it to code the weekly L.S.T. meetings. During the 1977-78 school year, the coordinator attended the weekly L.S.T. meetings and continued to use the form. The Project P.A.V.E. staff assisted the coordinator in checking students' schedules and teachers to provide needed follow-up information.

The following were the primary codes for changes:

(a) no change - the student received no new formal service.
(b) support services - in this category was classified any direct service, relating to the reason for referral, to the student or parent. Providing a student with a staff member to check in with every day, were examples of suggestions coded "on-campus support referrals." Specific referrals to a community agency were coded as "off-campus support referrals."
(c) schedule change - changes in a student's teacher for a course, a course within a department, or from a course in one department to a course in another department were coded in this category.

(d) program change - a more substantial change than a schedule change - a change into vocational program, or a major change within vocational programs, or into or out of special educational program.

The following were the primary coding questions to determine the possible processes accounting for a decision:

(a) evaluating information - sharing as "crucial, helpful, or unnecessary." Primarily this provided a basis for coding a decision to make no changes. Through a discussion, it may occur that the best option at the time would be to continue services as is. And when information-sharing was seen as "crucial" or "helpful" and yet change was made, this category was important.

(b) "L.S.T. members were ___motivated or ____frustrated." When no changes were made, this allowed for a coding of whether the process was still helpful ("motivated") or whether there was a clear awareness that one of a variety of changes needed to be made, but the options were not available ("frustrated").

Summary of Results

During 1975-76, special education students were discussed by the L.S.T. seven times. During 1976-77, special education students were discussed by the L.S.T. 126 times. During 1977-78, special education students were discussed 66 times.

Fewer changes were made for this year's 9th-grade students than for last year's 9th-grade students. This year 10 of 27 (37.0%) 9th-graders received changes whereas 12 of 25 (48%) 9th-grade students received changes last year. Five of 19 (26.3%) 9th-grade students received changes during the 1975-76 school year.

Fewer changes were made for this year's 10th-grade students than for last year's 10th-grade students. This year 5 of 18 (27.7%) 10th-graders received changes whereas 9 of 18 (50%) 10th-grade students received changes last year.

More changes were made for this year's 11th-grade students than for last year's 11th-grade students. This year 9 of 18 (50%) 11th-graders received changes, whereas 3 of 14 (21.4%) 11th-graders received changes last year.

More special education students did well this year, as measured by a student earning 5 or more credits for each quarter, than last year. This year 35 of 63 (55.5%) special education students did well, whereas 24 of 56 (42.1%) special education students did well last year.

For the concerns referred to the L.S.T. during the 1977-78 school year, 20 (30.3%) times the L.S.T. was not able to resolve these concerns.

Seven times this was because the L.S.T. did not have enough information about the needs of the students. Five times this was because the L.S.T. did not have available program options which would have met the student's needs. Eight times the L.S.T. recommendations were not implemented.

For the concerns referred to the L.S.T. during the 1977-78 school year 15 times these concerns were resolved satisfactorily for the L.S.T. by placing a student in a different course or program. Nine times a program or course change failed to resolve the concerns.

Figure B-1 presents the 1976-77 and 1977-78 L.S.T.'s suggested, implemented, and helpful changes for 9th, 10th, and 11th-graders combined.

Figure B-2 presents the changes and number of students doing well as analyzed by grade level for the 1976-77 and 1977-78 school years.

Figure B-3 presents the changes for students as analyzed for each specific student for the 1977-78 school year.

	Number Suggested		Number Implemented		Number Helpful*	
	1976-77	1977-78	1976-77	1977-78	1976-77	1977-78
(a) no changes	33	13	33	13		
(b) on-campus referrals	5	15	3	15		
(c) off-campus referrals	9	8	9	5		
(d) schedule changes	12	9	6	8	5	4
(e) program changes	27	21	26	16	20	11

*A change was classified as "helpful" if the student received credit(s) for the new course(s).

B-6

Figure B-1. SUGGESTED, IMPLEMENTED AND HELPFUL CHANGES RECOMMENDED BY THE L.S.T.

Grade level and year:	9th 76-77	9th 77-78	10th 76-77	10th 77-78	11th 76-77	11th 77-78
Total number in grade:	25	27	18	18	14	18
1. Total (%) doing well*	12 (48%)	17 (62.9%)	7 (38.9%)	9 (50%)	5 (27.8%)	9 (50%)
2. Total (%) for whom no changes were made	13 (52%)	17 (62.9%)	9 (50%)	13 (72.2%)	11 (78.6%)	9 (50%)
3. Total (%) for whom no changes were made who were not doing well	5 (38.9%)	5 (29.4%)	5 (55.6%)	5 (38.4%)	7 (63.6%)	4 (44.4%)
4. Schedule changes	4	3	2	2	0	3
5. Schedule changes helpful**	3	2	2	0	0	2
6. Program changes	9	4	13	3	4	5
7. Program changes helpful	8	2	9	2	3	3

B-7

* "doing well" was defined by a student's earning five or more credits for each of the three quarters.

** "helpful" was defined by a student's earning credits in the new course(s).

Figure B-2. YEARLY STATUS OF CHANGES FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS.

27 9th-graders

17: students were not discussed by the L.S.T. during the 1977-78 school year.
- 12: doing well; these students averaged 16.3 credits this year.
- 5: not doing well*; these students averaged 10.2 credits for the school year.

3: students were discussed by the L.S.T., but did not receive any change of services as a result of the meeting.
- 0: doing well.
- 3: not doing well; these students averaged 4 credits this year.

5: L.S.T. recommended that the resource teachers assist these students.
- 3: doing well; these students averaged 17.3 credits this year.
- 2: not doing well; these students averaged 9.5 credits this year.

1: L.S.T. recommended that the student be referred to a community agency for psychiatric counseling; student not doing well; earned 7 credits for the school year.

3: L.S.T. recommended schedule changes for students.
- 1: recommended for VEH; successful; student doing well; earned 17 credits this year.
- 1: recommended OJT; successful; student not doing well; earned 4 credits this year.
- 1: recommended student take an auto mechanics course; not successful; student not doing well; earned 0 credits this year.

4: L.S.T. recommended program changes.
- 2: into special education.
  - 1: student not doing well for the year (earned 11 credits), but program change was successful since student earned 5 credits for the 3rd quarter after change was made.
  - 1: student not doing well; earned 8 credits for the year.
- 1: recommended vocational curriculum; student doing well; earned 15 credits this year.
- 1: recommended a change in instructional arrangement from integrated to resource; student not doing well; earned 0 credits this year.

---

* "doing well" was defined by a student's earning five or more credits for each of the three quarters. A schedule or program change was "successful" if the student received credit for the new course or program.

Figure B-3. CHANGES FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS DERIVED FROM L.S.T. (Page 1 of 3)

18 10th-graders

12: students were not discussed by the L.S.T. during the 1977-78 school year.
- 8: doing well; these students averaged 16.37 credits this year.
- 4: not doing well; these students averaged 10.25 credits for the school year.

3: students were discussed by the L.S.T. but did not receive any change of services as a result of the meeting.
- 0: doing well.
- 1: dropped out of school.
- 2: not doing well; these students averaged 1.5 credits this year.

5: L.S.T. recommended that the resource teachers assist these students.
- 0: doing well.
- 3: dropped out.
- 2: not doing well; these students averaged 5.5 credits this year.

1: L.S.T. recommended a Parent Conference; student not doing well; earned 11 credits this year.

1: recommended that student receive help from E.S.S.A.; student dropped out.

2: recommended that student receive help from outside community agencies.
- 1: referred to Project Try.
- 1: referred to Shoal Creek Alcoholic Unit (P.A.A.S.A.); student not doing well; earned 1 credit this year.

2: L.S.T. recommended schedule changes for students.
- 1: recommended a change of teacher; not successful; student dropped out.
- 1: recommended that student be placed in the resource room; not successful; student not doing well; earned 10 credits this year.

3: L.S.T. recommended program changes.
- 2: recommended vocational curriculum.
  - 1: successful; student doing well; earned 16 credits this year.
  - 1: successful; student not doing well; earned 12 credits this year.
- 1: recommended self-contained classroom; not successful; student not doing well; earned 11 credits this year.

18 11th-graders

9: students were not discussed by the L.S.T. during the 1977-78 school year.
- 5: doing well; these students averaged 17.8 credits this year.
- 4: not doing well; these students averaged 12 credits for the school year.

Figure B-3. (continued, Page 2 of 3)

2: students were discussed by the L.S.T., but did not receive any change of services as a result of the meeting.
- 1: dropped out of school.
- 1: not doing well; earned 9 credits this year.

2: L.S.T. recommended that the resource teachers assist these students. Both doing well; these students averaged 16.5 credits this year.

3: recommended that student receive help from outside community agency.
- 1: referred to Texas Rehabilitation Commission.
- 1: referred to UT Job Readiness Clinic.
- 1: recommended psychiatric counseling; not implemented, student not doing well; earned 9 credits this year.

3: L.S.T. recommended schedule changes for students
- 2: recommended VEH.
  - 1: successful; student doing well; earned 16 credits this year.
  - 1: not successful; student not doing well; earned 6 credits this year.
- 1: recommended OJT: successful; student not doing well; earned 9 credits this year.

3: L.S.T. recommended program changes.
- 2: recommended change in instructional arrangement from integrated to resource; not successful; students not doing well; these students averaged 4 credits for this year.
- 2: into special education.
  - 1: successful; student doing well; earned 15 credits this year.
  - 1: successful; student not doing well; earned 12 credits this year.
- 1: recommended vocational curriculum; successful; student doing well; earned 16 credits this year.

3 12th-graders

3: L.S.T. recommended program changes.
- 1: into special education; successful; student doing well; earned 18 credits this year.
- 1: recommended change in instructional arrangement from integrated to resource; successful; student doing well; earned 16 credits this year.
- 1: recommended vocational curriculum; successful; student not doing well; earned 12 credits this year.

Figure B-3 (continued, Page 3 of 3)

L.S.T. ANALYSIS

1. Student Name _____ 2. Date _____

3. Number of times this student has been previously discussed by LST ___

4. Referral: _____teacher requested _____6-week review

_____in-depth review _____follow-up _____other

5. Reason for Referral:

As a result of this meeting:

6. Student will receive no new formal service _____
7. Services will be discussed as a result of support personnel inquiry (e.g., testing, home visit) _____
8. Teachers will be informed about materials _____
9. Student or parent will receive support services (e.g., counseling, tutor) _____
10. The student's schedule will change _____
11. A new program option will be initiated _____
12. LST became ARD committee to provide new program to student _____
13. Follow-up _____ was _____not scheduled
14. Information generated by LST discussion:

15. The alternative decided upon by LST was:
_____most effective _____acceptable _____minimally acceptable
16. Information-sharing relative to the procedure decided upon was:
_____crucial _____helpful _____unnecessary
17. LST members were: _____motivated through sharing of information
_____frustrated at lack of program options

Procedures recommended by the LST:	Procedures actually carried out:	Feedback of procedures and results given? To whom?

Figure B-4. L.S.T. ANALYSIS FORM

Appendix C

STUDENT TRANSCRIPT DATA

Instrument Description: Student Transcript Data

Brief description of the instrument:

Student transcripts with report cards provided the following information: student achievement (credits earned), the vocational classes in which special education students enrolled, and the number of resource room and "out-classes" in which a student was enrolled.

To whom was the instrument administered?

Transcripts of 9th, 10th, and 11th-grade special education students from 1976-77 and 1977-78 were used.

How many times was the instrument administered?

Once.

When was the instrument administered?

Throughout the 1977-78 school year.

Who administered the instrument?

Project P.A.V.E. Evaluator from the Office of Research and Evaluation.

What training did the administrators have?

General training in instrument and interview administration.

Was the instrument administered under standardized conditions?

Yes.

Were there problems with the instrument or the administration that might affect the validity of the data?

No.

Who developed the instrument?

Project P.A.V.E Evaluator from the Office of Research and Evaluation.

What reliability and validity data are available on the instrument?

None.

Are there norm data available for interpreting the results?

No.

STUDENT TRANSCRIPT DATA

Purpose

There were three main purposes in reviewing the transcripts: (1) to determine the number of credits earned by special education students, (2) to determine the vocational classes and P.A.V.E.-supported classes in which special education students were enrolled, and (3) to determine the number of resource room and out-classes (regular classes, not in the resource room) in which 9th-grade special education over the past three years were enrolled. The following questions were addressed:

Decision Question 1.0: Should Project P.A.V.E. activities be disseminated to other districts?

Evaluation Question 1.1: To what extent have school sponsored activities involved special education students?

1.4: To what extent have identified special education students earned credits toward graduation?

Decision Question 2.0: Should Project P.A.V.E. be adopted by schools of A.I.S.D.?

Evaluation Question 2.6: What changes are there in student achievement?

2.7: What is student participation in alternative programming options and other P.A.V.E. activities?

Procedure

Each student's transcript in the registrar's office was reviewed by the evaluator.

1. Achievement. To compare one grade level across two years (e.g. 9th-graders in 1976-77 compared to 9th-graders in 1977-78), credit data were compiled for each student enrolled in 1977-78 that did not drop out. Credit data for students enrolled in 1975-76 and 1976-77, were taken from the 1976-77 Technical Report for Project P.A.V.E. To compare one group of students across years (e.g., 9th graders in 1976-77 compared to themselves as 10th-graders in 1977-78), only transcripts of those students who were registered for all six quarters of the two year period were used.

For comparisons of grade levels across years, data were analyzed using a t-test for uncorrelated means. To compare one group across grade levels, data were analyzed using a t-test for correlated means.

2. Vocational classes. A list was made of the vocational classes in which students were enrolled.

3. Degree of mainstreaming. For 9th-graders in 1975-76, 1976-77, and 1977-78 a table was made of the special education and regular education classes in which they were enrolled and in which they received credit for the first quarter of the 9th grade.

Summary of Results

1. Achievement

There were no significant differences in the total credits, special education, regular, or vocational credits earned between this year's 9th-graders and last year's 9th-grade class. Although the mean for 1977-78 9th-grade special education students was below the mean for 1976-77 9th-graders in all four categories, these differences were not significant. (See Figure C-1)

During 1977-78, 10th-grade special education students earned fewer total yearly credits and regular credits than did the 1976-77 10th-grade special education class. This year's class earned more special education and vocational credits than did last year's class. These differences, however, were not statistically significant. (see Figure C-2)

During 1977-78, 11th-grade special education students earned more special education credits, but fewer total yearly, regular, and vocational credits than did the 1976-77 11th-grade class. Again, these differences were not statistically significant. (see Figure C-3).

This year's 10th-graders earned significantly more vocational credits this year than they did last year as 9th-graders. There were no other significant differences found. (see Figure C-4)

This year's 11th-graders earned significantly more special education and vocational credits this year than they did last year as 10th-graders. (see Figure C-5)

2. Vocational classes and other P.A.V.E.-related classes.

Travis High School special education students participated in the following vocational programs (not all of which are located at that school's campus:

Regular Vocational Programs:
Cooperative Vocational Academic Education (CVAE)
small engine repair
auto body repair
Vocational Education Classes
food service
cosmetology
bricklaying
letter press
Special Education Programs:
Pre-vocational class in the resource room
Vocational Education for the Handicapped (VEH)
office duplication procedures
general construction trades
clerical practices
building trades
On the Job Training (OJT)
cafeteria work station
OJT under the leadership of the vocational adjustment coordinator

For the 1976-77 and 1977-78 school year, the following number of students participated in vocational courses (not counting the pre-vocational course):

1976-77		1977-78
10 of 25 (40%)	9th-graders	12 of 27 (44.4%)
10 of 18 (55.6%)	10th-graders	11 of 18 (61.1%)
8 of 14 (57.2%)	11th-graders	14 of 18 (78.3%)

Figure C-6 presents the number of students participating in each vocational option.

Twenty-six special education students were enrolled in the Adaptive Physical Education course during the 1977-78 school year.

Fifteen students enrolled and received credit for the Pre-employment Lab taught during the 1977-78 school year.

Two students participated in the on-campus, cafeteria work-station. Both students participated in this course for two quarters.

These data are presented in Figure C-6.

3. Degree of Mainstreaming

The 1975-76, 1976-77, and 1977-78 first quarter schedules of 9th-graders were obtained to determine if the students were spending comparable amounts of time in special education and regular classes-to determine if special education students were being mainstreamed

more or less than in previous years. The number of credits earned was used as an indication of the success of these placements. During the first quarter special education students were scheduled into regular classes during 1977 slightly more often than in the past, but they tended to earn approximately the same number of credits as in the past.

These data are presented in Figure C-7.

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	t-VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	TWO-TAILED PROBABILITY
Total Yearly Credits							
1977-78	27	13.3703	4.7729	0.919	1.7363	42	0.0898
1976-77	17	15.3529	2.760	0.669			
Special Education Credits							
1977-78	27	3.814	3.397	0.654	0.9310	42	0.3570
1976-77	17	4.824	3.450	0.687			
Regular Education Credits							
1977-78	27	9.5555	5.3517	1.029	0.6355	42	0.5284
1976-77	17	10.5294	3.875	0.940			
Vocational Credits							
1977-78	27	1.4074	2.098	0.403	1.6105	42	0.1147
1976-77	17	2.5294	2.348	0.570			

Figure C-1. T-TEST COMPARISONS OF CREDITS EARNED BETWEEN 1976-77 AND 1977-78 9TH-GRADE SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS.

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	t-VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	TWO-TAILED PROBABILITY
Total Yearly Credits							
1977-78	18	12.1111	5.2005	1.2257	1.057	30	0.2986
1976-77	14	13.8571	3.348	0.8950			
Special Education Credits							
1977-78	18	5.5555	5.0088	1.1805	0.2105	30	0.8346
1976-77	14	3.7143	2.8670	0.7666			
Regular Education Credits							
1977-78	18	6.6111	5.8524	1.2794	1.860	30	0.0725
1976-77	14	10.1429	4.092	1.094			
Vocational Credits							
1977-78	18	5.0555	4.3854	1.0336	0.7440	30	0.4626
1976-77	14	3.8571	4.365	1.167			

Figure C-2. T-TEST COMPARISONS OF CREDITS EARNED BETWEEN 1976-77 AND 1977-78 10TH GRADE SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS.

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	t-VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	TWO-TAILED PROBABILITY
Total Yearly Credits							
1977-78	18	13.388	4.742	1.118	0.8720	24	0.3918
1976-77	8	15.125	3.907	1.381			
Special Education Credits							
1977-78	18	6.833	5.659	1.334	0.4658	24	0.6454
1976-77	8	5.625	6.301	2.228			
Regular Education Credits							
1977-78	18	6.5555	6.061	1.428	1.1458	24	0.2631
1976-77	8	9.500	5.202	1.871			
Vocational Credits							
1977-78	18	6.500	5.894	1.389	0.4145	24	0.6822
1976-77	8	7.625	6.653	2.352			

Figure C-3. T-TEST COMPARISONS OF CREDITS EARNED BETWEEN 1976-77 AND 1977-78 11TH-GRADE SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS.

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	t-VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	TWO-TAILED PROBABILITY
Total Yearly Credits							
9th-grade	18	12.666	6.174	1.455	0.4509	17	0.6577
10th-grade		12.111	5.201	1.226			
Special Education Credits							
9th-grade	18	4.778	4.772	1.125	0.6025	17	0.5548
10th-grade		5.555	5.009	1.181			
Regular Education Credits							
9th-grade	18	7.333	4.887	1.152	0.6123	17	0.5484
10th-grade		6.611	5.852	1.379			
Vocational Credits							
9th-grade	18	1.944	2.363	0.557	3.2536	17	0.0046
10th-grade		5.055	4.385	1.034			

Figure C-4. T-TEST COMPARISONS OF CREDITS EARNED BETWEEN 9TH-GRADERS in 1976-77 COMPARED TO THEMSELVES AS 10TH-GRADERS IN 1977-78.

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	t-VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	TWO-TAILED PROBABILITY
Total Yearly Credits							
10th-grade	18	12.888	4.404	1.038	0.4768	17	0.6395
11th-grade		13.388	4.742	1.118			
Special Education Credits							
10th-grade	18	4.444	4.368	1.029	2.5050	17	0.0227
11th-grade		6.833	5.659	1.334			
Regular Education Credits							
10th-grade	18	8.444	4.755	1.121	1.814	17	0.0873
11th-grade		6.555	6.061	1.428			
Vocational Credits							
10th-grade	18	3.555	4.218	0.944	2.5659	17	0.0200
11th-grade		6.555	5.894	1.389			

Figure C-5. T-TEST COMPARISONS OF CREDITS EARNED BETWEEN 10TH-GRADE STUDENTS IN 1976-77 COMPARED TO THEMSELVES AS 11TH-GRADERS IN 1977-78.

	1975-76			1976-77			1977-78		
Grade:	9th	10th	11th	9th	10th	11th	9th	10th	11th
CVAE	0	0	0	3	1	0	5	2	3
Pre-vocational course*	12	3	1	15	3	2	8	1	2
VEH*	was not offered			4	6	1	4	7	4
Vocational education class	0	3	4	1	5	4	0	2	2
Cafeteria work station*	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	2
On the job training (OJT)*	0	3	2	1	1	4	3	5	8

*special education program options

Figure C-6. VOCATIONAL PARTICIPATION: TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN EACH GRADE PARTICIPATING FOR ONE OR MORE QUARTERS.

	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78
number of students	16.00	16	22
scheduled into the resource room (total credits)	26.00	36	34
scheduled into the resource room (average per student)	1.63	2.25	1.33
scheduled into the regular classes (total credits)	62.00	59	102
scheduled into regular classes (average per student)	3.87	3.68	4.81
credits earned in resource room (total credits)	24.00	34.00	32
average credits earned in resource room	1.50	2.12	1.25
credits earned in regular classes (total credits)	47	51	72
average credits earned	2.93	3.18	3.25

C-13

Figure C-7. USE OF ON-CAMPUS TIME FOR 9TH-GRADERS DURING THE FIRST QUARTER.

Appendix D

STUDENT ATTENDANCE DATA

Instrument Description: Student Attendance Data

Brief description of the instrument:

Attendance and drop-out (school leaver) information on special education students was gathered from the attendance office of Travis High School.

To whom was the instrument administered?

All 9th, 10th, and 11th-grade identified special education students in 1975-76, 1976-77, and 1977-78.

How many times was the instrument administered?

Once.

When was the instrument administered?

Throughout the year.

Who administered the instrument?

Project P.A.V.E. Evaluator from the Office of Research and Evaluation.

What training did the administrators have?

General training in instrument and interview administration.

Was the instrument administered under standardized conditions?

No.

Were there problems with the instrument or the administration that might affect the validity of the data?

No.

Who developed the instrument?

Project P.A.V.E. Evaluator from the Office of Research and Evaluation.

What reliability and validity data are available on the instrument?

None.

Are there norm data available for interpreting the results?

No.

STUDENT ATTENDANCE DATA

Purpose

The purpose was to examine changes in attendance rates and drop-out (school leaver) rates for 1975-76, 1976-77, and 1977-78. The following questions were addressed:

Decision Question 1: Should Project P.A.V.E. activities be disseminated to other districts?

Evaluation Question 1.2: What are the attendance and drop-out statistics for special education students?

Decision Question 2: Should Project P.A.V.E. be adopted by schools of A.I.S.D.?

Evaluation Question 2.6: What changes are there in student drop-out rate and attendance?

Procedure

Attendance rates for 1977-78 of non-drop-outs (those who enrolled and did not drop-out for at least two of the three quarters), the same sample used for the comparison of credits earned, were collected from the attendance office of Travis High School. The attendance figures are expressed in terms of number of absences for the year.

Attendance rates for non-drop-outs for 1975-76 and 1976-77 were taken from the 1976-77 Technical Report for Project P.A.V.E.

Drop-out rates for 1977-78 were determined by withdrawal notices printed weekly by the Travis High School attendance office and by corresponding indications of withdrawal in the attendance record books.

Drop-out rates for 1975-76 and 1976-77 were taken from the 1976-77 Technical Report for Project P.A.V.E.

Since there was no significant difference between the attendance or drop-out rates for 1975-76 and 1976-77, t-tests were computed comparing the data from 1976-77 and 1977-78.

Summary of Results

There was no significant difference in attendance rates for any group this year compared to last year. The drop-out rate for this year is less than it was for last year.

The t-tests for attendance data are presented in Figure D-1.

The attendance rates are presented in Figure D-2.

The yearly drop-out rates are presented in Figure D-3.

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	t-VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	TWO-TAILED PROBABILITY
9th-grade							
1977-78	27	27.888	27.552	5.302			
					0.5630	42	0.5764
1976-77	17						
10th-grade							
1977-78	18	28.611	32.616	7.688			
					0.0117	30	0.9906
1976-77	14	28.500	20.869	5.577			
11th-grade							
1977-78	18	23.167	21.462	5.058			
					0.5808	24	0.5667
1976-77	8	28.750	22.340	7.898			

Figure D-1. T-TEST COMPARISONS OF ATTENDANCE RATES BY GRADE LEVEL BETWEEN 1976-77 AND 1977-78 SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS

Grade	Year	Number of Students	Average
Ninth	1975-76	17	23.1
	1976-77	17	23.4
	1977-78	27	27.8
Tenth	1975-76	11	31.0
	1976-77	14	28.5
	1977-78	18	28.6
Eleventh	1975-76	5	14.2
	1976-77	8	28.8
	1977-78	18	23.1

Figure D-2. AVERAGE YEARLY ABSENCES FOR NON-DROP-OUTS (expressed in number of days absent for the year)

	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78
Total number of special education students	49	60	66
Number leaving school	14	17	13
Percentage leaving school	28.6%	28.3%	19.6%

Figure D-3. DROP-OUT RATE

Appendix E

STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

Instrument Description: Staff Questionnaire

Brief description of the instrument:

The staff questionnaire provided information from the staff of Travis High School regarding their assessment of Project P.A.V.E.'s impact on their campus. The staff members were asked to evaluate the visibility, effectiveness, and probability of continuation of the various objectives proposed by Project P.A.V.E. The staff were asked to evaluate only those activities they were involved with.

To whom was the instrument administered?

Travis High School Principal and Assistant Principal, the resource room teachers, and a random sample of all classroom teachers with at least one identified special education student registered.

How many times was the instrument administered?

Once.

Who administered the instrument?

Project P.A.V.E. Evaluator from the Office of Research and Evaluation.

What training did the administrators have?

General training in instrument and interview administration.

Was the instrument administered under standardized conditions?

No.

Were there problems with the instrument or the administration that might affect the validity of the data?

Since some of the regular teachers did not respond to the instrument, it is possible that their responses may vary from those teachers who did respond.

Who developed the instrument?

Project P.A.V.E. Evaluator from the Office of Research and Evaluation.

What reliability and validity data are available on the instrument?

None.

Are there norm data available for interpreting the results?

No.

STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

Purpose

The primary purpose of this instrument was to determine: (1) the awareness of the staff of the objectives of Project P.A.V.E., (2) the perceived value of these objectives, and (3) the perceived possibility of continuing the objectives of Project P.A.V.E. for the coming year. The following questions were addressed:

Decision Question 1.0: Should Project P.A.V.E. activities be disseminated to other districts?

Evaluation Question 1.6: How do school personnel perceive Project P.A.V.E.'s effectiveness?

Decision Question 2.0: Should Project P.A.V.E. be adopted by schools of A.I.S.D.?

Evaluation Question 2.8: What changes are there in teacher's reported classroom practices and attitudes with identified special education students?

2.10: What activities do L.S.T. members think they can and will carry on without P.A.V.E.?

2.11: Do teachers who attend in-service training report positive effects for their work with special education students?

Procedure

This instrument was developed by the evaluator and reviewed by the Project P.A.V.E. coordinator. For each objective of Project P.A.V.E., the staff was asked to assess: (1) whether the objectives had been carried out, (2) whether the objectives were effective, and (3) the probability that the objective would be continued next year.

Since not all of the staff were involved with all of the Project P.A.V.E. activities, staff members were asked to respond to only those objectives with which they were involved. This necessitated the development of 3 forms of the questionnaire: (1) an administrative form given to the principal, assistant principal, and counselors (see Figure E-1); (2) a special education form, given to the special education teachers, (see Figure E-2); and (3) a regular form given to regular teachers who had

had at least one identified special education student during the year (see Figure E-3). These three forms differed only in terms of the objectives evaluated.

The regular form also included questions about the effectiveness of the inservice training program provided by Project P.A.V.E. (see Figure E-3).

Questionnaires were distributed to the principal, assistant principal, all 4 counselors, all 3 special education teachers, and a random sample of 30 regular classroom teachers. Questionnaires were returned from the principal, assistant principal, 3 of the 4 counselors, all 3 special education teachers, and 12 of the 30 regular classroom teachers.

The questionnaire was administered in May, 1978. Results were content coded and tabulated by hand.

Summary of Results

The staff perceived the following activities as being most helpful: 1) Jr.-Sr. conference, 2) vocational testing, 3) planning conferences, 4) pre-employment lab, 5) adaptive P.E., 6) cafeteria work station, 7) student monitoring, 8) in-depth review, 9) parental involvement, and 10) materials use and dissemination.

Nine of 11 (81.8%) teachers surveyed indicated that there was increased communication between the regular teachers and the special education teachers. All 11 teachers indicated that the presence of Project P.A.V.E. on their campus had created an awareness of the needs of special education students. Ten of 11 teachers felt that whenever possible special education students should be involved in the regular classroom. These same ten teachers, however, agreed that the amount of time requires of the regular teacher to meet the needs of the special education students takes away from the learning of regular students. Seven of the 11 (63.6%) teachers felt that there were not sufficient resources available to regular teachers to help them meet the needs of special education students.

The following activities will probably be continued next year in the absence of Project P.A.V.E.: 1) vocational testing, 2) student monitoring, 3) in-depth reviews, 4) teacher meetings, and 5) materials use and dissemination.

Eight of 9 teachers surveyed indicated that the inservice program was effective and that the training received in the workshop generalized to the classroom.

Figure E-4 presents the results of the administrative form of the staff survey.

Figure E-5 presents the results of the special education form of the staff survey.

Figure E-6 presents the results of the regular form of the staff survey.

Staff Questionnaire
Administrative Form

Position: Principal
Assistant Principal
Counselor

Activity	Visibility Has this activity been carried out? 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't Know	Effectiveness This activity has been: 1. definitely helpful 2. moderately helpful 3. somewhat helpful 4. of questionable help 5. no information	Probability of Continuation 1. will definitely continue 2. will probably continue 3. may or may not continue 4. will probably not continue 5. will not continue--depends entirely on P.A.V.E.
1. Vocational Testing	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
2. Planning Conferences (Parents)	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
3. Planning Conferences (Students)	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
4. Student Monitoring	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
5. In-depth Review	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
6. Teacher Meetings	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
7. Materials Use and Dissemination	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5

Figure E-1. ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE.

Staff Questionnaire

Special Education Form

Position: Special Education Teachers (2)
Helping Teacher

Activity	Visibility Has this activity been carried out? 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't Know	Effectiveness This activity has been: 1. definitely helpful 2. moderately helpful 3. somewhat helpful 4. of questionable help 5. of no help 6. no information	Probability of Continuation 1. will definitely continue 2. will probably continue 3. may or may not continue 4. will probably not continue 5. will not continue - - depends entirely on P.A.V.E.
1. Parent Interview	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
2. Jr.-Sr. Conference	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
3. Vocational Testing	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
4. Student Interview	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
5. Planning Conference (Parents)	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
6. Planning Conference (Students)	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
7. Pre-employment Lab	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
8. Adaptive P. E.	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
9. Cafeteria Work Station	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
10. Student Orientation	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
11. Student Monitoring	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
12. In-depth Survey	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
13. Parental Involvement	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
14. Resources Use and Dissemination	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
15. Regular Teacher Inservice Program	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
16. Training in Vocational Assessment	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5

Figure E-2. SPECIAL EDUCATION STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

Staff Questionnaire
Regular Form

Position: Regular Classroom Teachers

Activity	Visibility Has this activity been carried out? 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't Know	Effectiveness This activity has been: 1. definitely helpful 2. moderately helpful 3. somewhat helpful 4. of questionable help 5. of no help 6. no information	Probability of Continuation 1. will definitely continue 2. will probably continue 3. may or may not continue 4. will probably not continue 5. will not continue -- depends entirely on P.A.V.E.
1. Adaptive P.E.	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
2. Teacher Meetings	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
3. Materials Use and Dissemination	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
4. Student Monitoring	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
5. IEP Attendance	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5
6. Increased Communication with Special Education Teachers	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4 5

For each of the following statements, please indicate whether you:
1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. No Opinion
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

1. Given that students are not severely handicapped, special education students can learn better in the regular classrooms. 1 2 3 4 5

2. Whenever possible, special education students should be involved in the regular curriculum. 1 2 3 4 5

3. The amount of time required of a regular teacher to meet the needs of special education students takes away from the learning of regular students. 1 2 3 4 5

4. A regular teacher has sufficient resources available to meet the needs of special education students. 1 2 3 4 5

5. Although there are sufficient resources available to regular teachers, most teachers do not have the time to make use of these resources. 1 2 3 4 5

6. The presence of Project P.A.V.E. on campus has created an awareness of the needs of special education students 1 2 3 4 5

7. Did you attend the workshops sponsored by Project P.A.V.E.? (If Yes, answer 8&9) Yes ____ No ____

8. Was the inservice program (the combination of workshop and the use of consultants) effective? Yes ____ No ____

9. Did the training you received in the workshop generalize to the classrooms? Yes ____ No ____

Figure E-3. REGULAR STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE.

Position: Principal
Assistant Principal
Counselors (3)

Activity	Visibility Has this activity been carried out? Yes	No	Don't Know	Effectiveness This activity has been 1. definitely helpful 2. moderately helpful 3. somewhat helpful 4. of questionable help 5. of no help 6. no information 1	2	3	4	5	6	Probability of Continuation 1. will definitely continue 2. will probably continue 3. may or may not continue 4. will probably not continue 5. will not continue - depends entirely on P.A.V.E. 1	2	3	4	5
1. Vocational Testing	3	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	0
2. Planning Conferences (Parents)	5	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	1	0
3. Planning Conferences (Students)	4	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0
4. Student Monitoring	4	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	0
5. In-depth Review	2	1	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	1
6. Teacher Meetings	3	0	2	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	1	0
7. Materials Use and Dissemination	5	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0

E-9

Figure E-4. ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE
Responses reported as frequencies
Administered May, 1978

Position: Special education teachers (2)
Helping teacher

Activity	Visibility: Has this activity been carried out? Yes	No	Don't Know
1. Parent Interview	3	0	0
2. Jr.-Sr. Conference	2	1	0
3. Vocational Testing	3	0	0
4. Student Interview	3	0	0
5. Planning Conference (Parents)	3	0	0
6. Planning Conference (Students)	3	0	0
7. Pre-employment Lab	3	0	0
8. Adaptive P.E.	3	0	0
9. Cafeteria Work Station	3	0	0
10. Student Orientation	1	1	1
11. Student Monitoring	3	0	0
12. In-depth Review	3	0	0
13. Parental Involvement	3	0	0
14. Materials Use and Dissemination	3	0	0
15. Regular Teacher Inservice Program	3	0	0
16. Training in Vocational Assessment	3	0	0

Figure E-5. SPECIAL EDUCATION STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE
Responses reported as frequencies
Administered May, 1978 (Page 1 of 3)

Effectiveness
This activity has been:
1. definitely helpful
2. moderately helpful
3. somewhat helpful
4. of questionalle help
5. of no help
6. no information

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Parent Interview	0	2	1	0	0	0
2. Jr.-Sr. Conference	2	0	0	0	0	1
3. Vocational Testing	2	1	0	0	0	0
4. Student Interview	0	2	1	0	0	0
5. Planning Conference (Parents)	1	1	1	0	0	0
6. Planning Conference (Student)	2	1	0	0	0	0
7. Pre-employment Lab	2	1	0	0	0	0
8. Adaptive P.E.	2	1	0	0	0	0
9. Cafeteria Work Station	2	1	0	0	0	0
10. Student Orientation	1	2	0	0	0	0
11. Student Monitoring	2	1	0	0	0	0
12. In-depth Review	2	1	0	0	0	0
13. Parental Involvement	2	1	0	0	0	0
14. Materials Use and Dissemination	2	1	0	0	0	0
15. Regular Teacher Inservice Program	1	2	0	0	0	0
16. Training in Vocational Assessment	1	1	1	0	0	0

Figure E-5. (continued, Page 2 of 3).

	Probability of Continuation 1. will definitely continue 2. will probably continue 3. may or may not continue 4. will probably not continue 5. will not continue-depends entirely on P.A.V.E.				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Parent Interview	1	0	1	0	1
2. Jr.-Sr. Conference	2	0	1	0	0
3. Vocational Testing	1	2	0	0	0
4. Student Interview	0	1	1	1	0
5. Planning Conferences (Parents)	2	1	0	0	0
6. Planning Conferences (Students)	2	1	0	0	0
7. Pre-employment Lab	2	1	0	0	0
8. Adaptive P.E.	2	1	0	0	0
9. Cafeteria Work Station	2	1	0	0	0
10. Student Orientation	0	2	1	0	0
11. Student Monitoring	2	1	0	0	0
12. In-depth Review	2	1	0	0	0
13. Parental Involvement	1	1	1	0	0
14. Materials Use and Dissemination	0	2	1	0	0
15. Regular Teacher Inservice Program	0	0	1	1	1
16. Training in Vocational Assessment	1	0	1	0	1

Figure E-5. (continued, Page 3 of 3).

Staff Questionnaire
Regular Teacher Form

Position: Regular Classroom Teachers

Activity	Visibility: Was this activity been carried out? Yes	No	Don't Know	Effectiveness: This activity has been 1. definitely helpful 2. moderately helpful 3. somewhat helpful 4. of questionable help 5. of no help 6. no information 1	2	3	4	5	6	Probability of Continuation: 1. will definitely continue 2. will probably continue 3. may or may not continue 4. will probably not continue 5. will not continue - depends entirely on P.A.V.E. 1	2	3	4	5
1. Adaptive P.E.	6	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	6	2	2	2	0	0
2. Teacher Meetings	9	1	1	3	3	4	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1
3. Materials Use and Dissemination	10	0	1	7	3	0	0	0	1	4	2	1	0	0
4. Student Monitoring	10	0	1	3	4	3	0	0	1	2	3	3	2	0
5. IEP Attendance	5	2	4	2	1	2	0	0	4	1	0	3	2	1
6. Increased Communications with Special Education Teachers	9	0	2	3	1	0	2	0	2	2	2	3	0	2

	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. No Opinion 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5
1. Given that students are not severely handicapped, special education students can learn better in the regular classroom.	6	2	0	1	0
2. Whenever possible, special education students should be involved in the regular curriculum.	3	5	1	0	0
3. The amount of time required of regular teacher to meet the needs of special education students takes away from the learning of regular students.	3	2	3	0	0
4. A regular teacher has sufficient resources available to meet the needs of special education students.	1	2	3	4	1
5. Although there are sufficient resources available to regular teachers, most teachers do not have the time to make use of these services.	2	5	1	2	1
6. The presence of Project P.A.V.E. on campus has created an awareness of the needs of special education students.	8	3	0	0	0
7. Did you attend the workshops sponsored by Project P.A.V.E.?	Yes (9)	No (2)			
8. Was the inservice program effective?	Yes (9)	No (1)			
9. Did the training you received in the workshops generalize to the classroom?	Yes (8)	No (1)			

Figure E-6. REGULAR TEACHER STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

Appendix F

A.I.S.D. STAFF SURVEY

Instrument Description: A.I.S.D. Staff Survey

Brief description of the instrument:

The A.I.S.D. staff survey provided information from special education teachers regarding the extent to which the same or similar activities developed by Project P.A.V.E. at Travis High School, have been implemented in the district's high schools.

To whom was the instrument administered?

One special education teacher was randomly selected from each high school campus.

How many times was the instrument administered?

Once.

Who administered the instrument?

Project P.A.V.E. Evaluator from the Office of Research and Evaluation.

What training did the administrators have?

General training in instrument and interview administration.

Was the instrument administered under standardized conditions?

No.

Were there problems with the instrument or the administration that might affect the validity of the data?

Only seven of eight schools responded to the survey.

Who developed the instrument?

Project P.A.V.E. Evaluator from the Office of Research and Evaluation.

What reliability and validity data are available on the instrument?

None.

Are there norm data available for interpreting the results?

No.

A.I.S.D. STAFF SURVEY

Purpose

The primary purpose of this instrument was to determine the extent to which the same or similar activities developed by Project P.A.V.E. at Travis High School, have been implemented in the Austin Independent School District.

The following questions were addressed:

Decision Question 2.0: Should Project P.A.V.E. be adopted by schools of A.I.S.D.?

Evaluation Question 2.2: To what extent have the same or similar activities developed by P.A.V.E. been implemented in other schools of A.I.S.D.?

Procedure

This instrument was developed by the evaluator and reviewed by the Project P.A.V.E. coordinator, and is presented in Figure F-3. A special education teacher was randomly selected from each high school campus. The instrument was mailed to the teachers in advance so that they could think about the questions. The teachers had the option of either filling out the survey and mailing it to the evaluator, or responding to it through a phone interview.

The interview consisted of 19 multiple choice items concerning the following ten activities:

(1) Parent Interview
(2) Junior High-Senior High School Conference
(3) Vocational Assessment
(4) Student Interview
(5) Parental Involvement
(6) Vocational Curriculum
(7) Adaptive P.E.
(8) Student Orientation
(9) Student Monitoring
(10) L.S.T.

Results were tabulated by hand.

Summary of Results

Two of the seven responding schools reported that most of the parents of special education students are interviewed at the beginning of the year regarding the needs of their children. The other five schools reported that some of the parents are interviewed.

Six of the schools reported that the parents are interviewed at parent conferences held at the school. Four schools reported that parents are also interviewed via home visits and phone contacts.

All seven schools reported that the high school special education teachers seek the input of the junior high school special education teachers regarding the needs of the incoming 9th-grade special education students.

All seven of the schools reported that they receive this input from the junior high school teachers through a formal meeting.

Five of the seven schools reported that some of the special education students were vocationally assessed, whereas two schools reported that special education students were rarely assessed.

Concerning the types of vocational tests used, five schools reported that they used the General Aptitude Test Battery, and three schools stated that they have used the Kuder Occupational Interest Survey.

Five of the seven schools reported all special education students were interviewed regarding their problems and successes in both regular and special education classes. One school reported that most of the special education students were interviewed and one school reported that no students were interviewed.

All six of the schools that reported that special education students were interviewed stated that the interview was conducted in the context of a counseling session.

In terms of the parents' involvement in the long and short range planning for their children, four schools reported that the parents' input was used in the development of an Individual Education Program (IEP). Two schools reported that the parents attended the IEP meeting but did not take an active role. One school reported that parents reviewed the IEP after it was developed.

Four schools reported that their campus provided a vocational curriculum (i.e., job finding skills) designed specifically for the needs of special education students.

None of the seven schools provided Adaptive P.E. courses during the 1977-78 school year.

Four of the schools reported that special education students attended an orientation regarding resources on their campus. This orientation was held in the context of an orientation for the regular students.

All seven schools reported that they had a system for monitoring the progress of special education students in regular classes. Six schools stated that special education teachers personally contacted the regular teachers. Four schools stated that regular teachers personally contacted the special education teachers. All seven schools stated that this monitoring process included written communications between the regular teachers and the special education teachers.

One school reported that special education students are monitored every two weeks, five schools reported that these students are monitored every three weeks, whereas one school stated that these students are monitored every six weeks.

Not including the annual A.R.D., four schools reported that special education students were reviewed by the L.S.T. for discipline referrals. Three schools reported that special education students were reviewed for excessive absenteeism, and two schools stated that special education students were reviewed by the L.S.T. when they were failing classes.

Only two of the seven schools reported that the results of vocational assessment were used when discussing options available to special education students being discussed by the L.S.T.

Figure F-1 presents the responses to the questionnaire.

Figure F-2 presents the A.I.S.D. Staff Survey.

1. Are parents of special education students interviewed?
   a. all parents are interviewed 0
   b. most parents are interviewed 2
   c. some parents are interviewed 5
   d. no parents are interviewed 0

2. How is the parent interview completed?
   a. home visit 4
   b. phone contact 4
   c. parent conference at school 6

3. Do high school special education teachers seek the input of junior high school special education teachers regarding the needs of the incoming 9-th grade students?
   a. Yes 7
   b. No 0

4. How is this input received?
   a. meeting 7
   b. phone contact 0
   c. written comments on student's folder

5. To what extent are special education students vocationally assessed?
   a. all students are tested 0
   b. most students are tested 0
   c. some students are tested 5
   d. students are rarely tested 2

6. Which vocational tests are used?
   a. General Aptitude Test Battery 5
   b. Non-verbal Aptitude Test Battery 0
   c. McCarron-Dials Work Evaluation System 0
   d. Wide Range Interest Opinion Test 0
   e. Kuder Occupational Interest Survey 3

7. Are special education students interviewed regarding their problems and successes in both regular and special education classes?
   a. all students are interviewed 5
   b. most students are interviewed 1
   c. some students are interviewed 0
   d. students are not interviewed 1

Figure F-1. A.I.S.D. STAFF SURVEY
Responses recorded as frequencies
Administered May, 1978
(Page 1 of 3)

9. To what extent are parents involved in the long and short range planning for their children?
   a. input used in development of IEP 4
   b. attend IEP but do not take an active role 2
   c. review IEP after it is developed 1

10. Does your school provide a vocational curriculum (i.e., job finding skills) designed specifically for the needs of special education students?
   a. Yes 4
   b. No 3

11. Does your campus provide Adaptive P.E.?
   a. Yes 0
   b. No 7

12. Do incoming special education students attend an orientation regarding resources on your campus?
   a. Yes 4
   b. No 3

13. What form does this orientation take?
   a. in the context of orientation with regular students 4
   b. in a separate orientation session 0

14. Do you have a system for monitoring the progress of special education students in regular classes?
   a. Yes 7
   b. No 0

15. How are students monitored?
   a. special education teachers personally contact regular teachers 6
   b. regular teachers personally contact special education teachers 4
   c. written communication between the regular teachers and special education teachers 7

16. How often are special education students monitored?
   a. every two weeks 1
   b. every three weeks 5
   c. every six weeks 1

Figure F-1. (continued, Page 2 of 3)

17. Not including the annual A.R.D., how often are special education students reviewed by the L.S.T.?
    a. they are never discussed 0
    b. when they are failing courses 2
    c. excessive absenteeism 3
    d. discipline referrals 4

18. Are the results of vocational assessment used when discussing options available to special education students being discussed by the L.S.T.?
    a. Yes 2
    b. No 5

Figure F-1. (continued, Page 3 of 3)

A.I.S.D. Staff Survey

1. Are the parents of special education students interviewed at the beginning of the year regarding the needs of their children?
   a. all parents are interviewed.
   b. most of the parents are interviewed.
   c. some of the parents are interviewed.
   d. none of the parents are interviewed.

2. If so, how is the interview completed? (Choose more than 1 option if appropriate)
   a. home visit.
   b. phone contact.
   c. parent conference at school.

3. Do the high school special education teachers seek the input of the junior high school special education teachers regarding the needs of the incoming ninth grade special education students?
   a. Yes b. No

4. If so, how is this input received? (Choose more than 1 option if appropriate)
   a. meeting
   b. phone contact
   c. written comments on student's folder
   d. other _____

5. To what extent are special education students vocationally assessed?
   a. all students are tested.
   b. most students are tested.
   c. some students are tested.
   d. students are rarely tested.

6. Which tests are used? (Choose more than 1 option if appropriate)
   a. General Aptitude Test Battery
   b. Non-verbal Aptitude Test Battery
   c. McCarron-Dials Work Evaluation System
   d. Wide Range Interest Opinion Test
   e. Kuder Occupational Interest Survey
   f. Other _____

7. Are special education students interviewed regarding their problems and successes in both regular and special education classes?
   a. all students are interviewed.
   b. most students are interviewed.
   c. some students are interviewed.
   d. students are not interviewed.

Figure F-2: AISD STAFF SURVEY (Page 1 of 3).

8. If so, how is this interview conducted?
   a. a set interview is used.
   b. interview conducted in the context of a counseling session.

9. To what extent are parents involved in the long and short range planning for their children?
   a. input used in development of IEP.
   b. Attend IEP but do not take an active role.
   c. Review of IEP after it is developed.

10. Does your school provide a vocational curriculum (i.e., job finding skills) designed specifically for the needs of special education students?
    a. Yes b. No

11. Does your campus provide Adaptive P.E. classes?
    a. Yes b. No

12. If Yes, who are the P.E. courses primarily designed for?
    a. physically handicapped.
    b. learning disabled students.
    c. both physically handicapped and learning disabled.

13. Do incoming special education students attend an orientation regarding resources on your campus?
    a. Yes b. No

14. If Yes, what form does this orientation take?
    a. in the context of orientation with regular students.
    b. in a separate orientation session for special education students only.

15. Do you have a system for monitoring the progress of special education students in regular classes?
    a. Yes b. No

16. If Yes, how are the students monitored?
    a. Special education teachers personally contact the regular teachers.
    b. Regular teachers personally contact special education teachers.
    c. Written communication between regular teachers and special education teachers.

17. How often are special education students monitored?
    a. every 3 weeks.
    b. every 6 weeks.
    c. every _____ week(s)
    d. only when difficulties arise.

Figure F-2. (continued, page 2 of 3).

18. Not including the annual A.R.D., how often are special education students reviewed by the L.S.T.?
    a. they are never discussed outside A.R.D.
    b. when they are failing courses.
    c. excessive absenteeism.
    d. discipline referrals.
    e. every _____week(s).
    f. other _____

19. Are the results of vocational assessment used when discussing options available to special education students being discussed by the L.S.T.?
    a. Yes b. No

Figure F-2. (continued, Page 3 of 3)

Appendix G

P.A.V.E. ACTIVITIES AND VERIFICATION DOCUMENTS

Instrument Description: P.A.V.E. Activities and Verification Documents

Brief description of the instrument:

The P.A.V.E. activities and verification documents were compiled by project staff and organized into a notebook.

To whom was the instrument administered?

All P.A.V.E. activities that were specified in the 1977-78 project grant.

How many times was the instrument administered?

Throughout the year.

Who administered the instrument?

The evaluator monitored the P.A.V.E. staff's compilation of the information.

What training did the administrators have?

General training in instrument and interview administration.

Was the instrument administered under standardized conditions?

No.

Were there problems with the instrument or the administration that might affect the validity of the data?

No.

Who developed the instrument?

P.A.V.E. staff developed the documentation procedures and the Evaluator from the Office of Research and Evaluation developed the monitoring procedures.

What reliability and validity data are available on the instrument?

None.

Are there norm data available for interpreting the results?

No.

P.A.V.E. ACTIVITIES AND VERIFICATION DOCUMENTS

Purpose

The purpose of P.A.V.E.'s activities and verification documents was to provide records of activities and dissemination materials. The evaluator's monitoring of this provided information relevant to the extent to which the model was implemented. The information from this was used to answer the following questions:

Decision Question 1.0: Should Project P.A.V.E. activities be disseminated to other districts?

Evaluation Questions:
- 1.3 Have objectives for the project been met?
- 1.5 What activities can be done by school personnel without additional expense?
- 1.6 What time commitment and personnel commitment are required for school personnel to conduct P.A.V.E. activities and how do they perceive its effectiveness?

Decision Question 2.0: Should Project P.A.V.E. be adopted by schools of A.I.S.D.?

Evaluation Questions:
- 2.3 What Systematic Planning Process activities have been most utilized?
- 2.7 What is student participation in alternative programming options and other P.A.V.E. activities?
- 2.12 How many parents participate in P.A.V.E. activities?

Procedure

At the beginning of the 1977-78 school year, the Project P.A.V.E. staff developed the documentation notebook. This notebook was organized according to the various objectives. Each objective was described and the relevant activities detailed. This description also included rationales, time frames, staff responsibilities, and verification procedures. The notebook also contained a Strategy Review and Evaluation Information on each objective. The strategy review (see Figure G-1) documented any procedural or time changes that occurred during the year. Reasons for these changes were also noted. The strategy review also contained recommendations for future implementation of the objectives based on the problems encountered. The evaluation information (see Figure G-2) documented the time and cost of implementing the various objectives.

At weekly staff meetings, entries into the documentation notebook would be discussed. A student notebook (see Figure G-3) was also developed by the P.A.V.E. staff to document the services performed for each student. This student notebook acted as a cross reference to the documentation notebook.

Summary of Results

The results indicate that 17 of 26 activities were to a large extent implemented. Four of the activities were partially implemented, and five of the activities were not implemented.

Activities:

I-A-2-a The parents of special education students will be interviewed regarding the needs of their students.
Met?: Yes.
Evidence: For 19 of 21 incoming 9th-grade students, a parent interview was completed. Of the 10th, 11th, and 12th grade students who were identified as special education students during the 1977-78 school year 4 of 14 parents were interviewed.

I-A-2-b A pre-school meeting will be scheduled involving the junior high and senior high school resource room teachers to make initial plans for incoming ninth grade special education students.
Met?: Yes.
Evidence: For 9 of 21 incoming 9th-grade students, a meeting was held with the junior high and senior high resource room teachers. A meeting was not held if the junior high teacher had retired over the summer, or if the incoming student attended a junior high school that did not offer special education services.

I-A-2-c A vocational assessment process for high school special education students.
Met?: Yes.
Evidence: Fourteen of 22 (63%) 9th-grade students were given the Social Pre-Vocational Information Battery. Twelve of 22 (54.5%) 9th-grade students were given the Wide Range Interest-Opinion Test. Ten of 13 (76.9%) 11th-grade students were given the McCarron-Dials Work Evaluation System.

I-A-2-d Special education students will be interviewed regarding their problems and successes in both regular and special education classes. Questions will also be asked regarding their present needs and post-high school plans.
Met?: Yes.
Evidence: During the 1977-78 school year, 8 of 74 students were interviewed.

I-A-3 A conference will be held among the Resource Room teacher, Counselor, parents, and student to make long range plans based on knowledge of the student's strengths and handicapping conditions.

Met?: Partially met.

Evidence: Planning conferences were held for 44 identified special education students (83%). The provision that counselors attend these meetings was not carried out. In general, the students did not attend these meetings.

I-A-4-a A specific curriculum of vocationally related skills will be taught to a minimum of seven special education students per quarter.

Met?: Partially met.

Evidence: A Pre-Employment Lab was developed and offered during the 1977-78 school year. Five students were enrolled and received credit for this course in each of the three quarters.

I-A-4-b An unpaid work training site will be utilized for special education students in the campus cafeteria.

Met?: Yes.

Evidence: Two students worked in the Cafeteria Work Station during the 1977-78 school year. Both of these students received certificates of employability co-signed by the principal and the cafeteria manager.

I-A-4-c An Adaptive Physical Education course will continue to be offered to orthopedically handicapped special education students.

Met?: Yes.

Evidence: Twenty-six special education students were enrolled in the Adaptive Physical Education course during the year.

I-A-5 Special Education students will receive information to serve as an orientation to the local campus - physical plant, staff, policies, and procedures. They will also receive an orientation to the P.A.V.E. strategies that will involve them during the year.

Met?: Yes.

Evidence: An orientation meeting was held at the beginning of the 1977-78 school year. Sixteen of 22 (72.7%) of the incoming 9th-grade students attended this session.

I-A-6-a Monitoring of all special education students' ability to succeed in high school will be conducted during each quarter.

Met?: Partially met.

Evidence: The monitoring procedures were implemented during the first and second quarters. The students were not monitored during the third quarter.

I-A-6-b Based on information found in the student monitoring process, an In-depth Review will be conducted by the Local Support Team at their discretion.
Met?: Yes.
Evidence: An In-depth Review was conducted for 10 special education students during the 1977-78 school year.

I-A-6-c Vocational test results will be used during the In-depth Reviews so that the information can be a partial base for program planning for the student.
Met?: Partially met.
Evidence: Vocational testing results were available for 5 of the 10 special education students who received In-depth Reviews.

I-A-7-a Evening meetings for parents of identified special education students will continue to be held to provide additional information on community resources available to both parents and their students. Speakers representing various agencies will be invited.
Met?: No.
Evidence: Since a new district policy required parents of special education students to attend an Individualized Education Program meeting (IEP), it was decided to not request parents to also attend these night meetings.

I-A-7-b A series of three Parent Tutoring Sessions will continue to be offered to parents of both special education students and students referred to the Local Support Team but not identified.
Met?: Yes.
Evidence: Five parents attended the first session, 3 parents attended the second meeting, and 1 parent attended the third meeting.

I-A-7-c A Parent Handbook to be used during parent interviews will be revised and information updated.
Met?: Yes.
Evidence: A revised copy of the parent handbook was sent to the parents of 66 special education students.

I-A-9-a Following a student review, on recommendation of the Local Support Team, the regular classroom teachers, resource teacher and P.A.V.E. staff will attend a group meeting.
Met?: No.
Evidence: The Local Support Team never recommended a Teacher Group Meeting during the 1977-78 school year.

I-A-9-c A survey of the Austin Independent School District Secondary Instructional Coordinators, department heads on each high school campus, and all high school resource teachers will be conducted to determine the effects of the quarter course study on scheduling special education students and the courses taught on each high school campus.

Met?: No.

Evidence: Because the quarter course survey conducted in May 1977 failed to yield any useful information, it was considered unfeasible to continue this activity for this project year. The people surveyed had little or no knowledge regarding learning characteristics of special education students and, therefore, were unable to provide data on which courses would be most appropriate for these students. Furthermore, the courses offered on each campus differ in format, and to some degree, content, thus making it impossible to make judgments or draw conclusions as to the most appropriate course route for special education students.

I-A-10 A Resource Bank of commercially produced and teacher-made materials and other products designed for special education students will continue to be maintained.

Met?: Yes.

Evidence: At a pre-school workshop, school personnel were informed about the materials resource bank. At this time, the procedures for checking out and evaluating materials were reviewed. A reference system was developed showing the appropriateness of the respective materials for specific courses and/or handicapping conditions.

I-A-11-a An inservice program will be continued to meet the needs of regular classroom teachers serving special education students.

Met?: Yes.

Evidence: There were two inservice programs during the 1977-78 school year. Twelve regular classroom teachers were selected to participate in the inservice program held during the 2nd quarter, and another 12 teachers participated in the program during the 3rd quarter. Four consultants were hired to work with these teachers for the duration of the quarter in which the inservice was held.

I-A-11-b To provide training to local campus personnel in the area of vocational assessment of special education students.

Met?: Yes.

Evidence: Training was provided for the resource room teachers in the administration of the Social Pre-Vocational

Information Battery and the Wide Range Interest Opinion Test. The Vocational Adjustment Coordinator assigned to the local campus was sent to an out of town workshop for training in the McCarron Dials Work Evaluation System.

I-A-11-c To provide training to local campus personnel in the teaching of the Pre-employment Lab curriculum.
Met?: Yes.
Evidence: The vocational/occupational coordinator for Project P.A.V.E. co-taught the Pre-employment Lab curriculum with the resource teacher during the 1st quarter, and provided consultation services to the resource teachers during the 2nd and 3rd quarters.

I-A-11-d To provide training to local campus personnel in the operation of the Cafeteria Work Station.
Met?: Yes.
Evidence: In the fall of 1977, the local campus was assigned a new cafeteria manager. The principal asked that no students be placed into the Cafeteria Work Station until the second quarter. During the 1st quarter, P.A.V.E. staff met with the manager on several occasions to discuss how the CWS functioned last year, and how it would function this year. Two students were assigned to the CWS during the 2nd and 3rd quarter.

I-A-11-e To provide training to local campus personnel (regular grade level counselors and vocational counselor) in the areas of counseling with special education students and parents of special education students.
Met?: No.
Evidence: The counselors were not involved in the Program Planning Conferences.

I-A-12 Information will be gathered from students who have dropped out of Travis High School.
Met?: Yes.
Evidence: A cumulative list of drop-outs was kept. Seventeen students (8 special education students and 9 regular students) who dropped out were interviewed.

I-B-7 Training will be provided to the Parent/Student Coordinator to facilitate the successful implementation of strategies I-A-7 a, b, c.
Met?: No.
Evidence: The project was unable to locate an appropriate training facility to meet the needs of the Parent/Student Coordinator.

P.A.V.E. has documented the time it took to complete many of the activities of the 1977-78 school year. This is presented below:

I-A-2-a The parent interview required approximately 2 hours per student. This included: a) 1/2 hour transportation time to and from home, b) 1/2 hour for the interview itself, and c) 1 hour arranging the meeting, verifying address, etc.
Staff Time: 52 hours by one staff member.
School Time: 0

I-A-2-b The junior high-senior high conference requires approximately 15 minutes for each student.
Staff Time: 48 hours for one staff member
School Time: 11 hours (4 hours for the 2 resource teachers at Travis and 1 hour for the 3 resource teachers from the feeder schools.

I-A-2-c The administration of the Wide Range Interest-Opinion Test requires approximately 1 hour per student. The administration of the Social Pre-Vocational Information Battery requires approximately 3 hours for a group of 4 students.
Staff Time: 32 hours for one staff member.
School Time: 0

I-A-2-d The student interview requires approximately 1/2 hour per student.
Staff Time: 8 hours for one staff member.
School Time: 0

I-A-3 The Planning Conference requires approximately 1 hour for each student for both one member of the project staff and the student's resource room teacher.
Staff Time: 44 hours by one staff member.
School Time: 44 hours by the resource room teachers.

I-A-5 The student orientation was held at the beginning of the school year with all staff members participating.
Staff Time: 15 hours for four staff members.
School Time: 0

I-A-6-a Student Monitoring requires approximately 44 hours per quarter of the project staff's time and approximately 5 minutes of the teachers' time per student.
Staff Time: 88 hours for the staff.
School Time: 13 hours for the regular teachers.

STRATEGY REVIEW

Strategy _____ **Number** _____

Description:

Rationale:

Procedures: **Time Line:**

Strategy Review

Time Changes/reason(s)

Recommendations based on problems encountered, ease of implementations, etc.

Procedural changes/reason(s)

Figure G-1. STRATEGY REVIEW

EVALUATION INFORMATION

Time required to implement activity:
Project Staff _____
Local school campus personnel _____

Cost to implement activity:
Consultants _____
Materials _____
Release Time _____
Other _____
Total Actual Cost $_____
Original Estimates:
Staff Time _____
Other expenses _____
Total Budgeted Cost $_____

Time/cost estimate for schools implementing activity without project staff _____

Number of students _____ participating; Number eligible _____
special education teachers _____ _____
regular teachers _____ _____
other _____ _____

Note:

Figure G-2. EVALUATION INFORMATION

STUDENT NOTEBOOK

Student _____ Classification _____
Educational Arrangement _____ Grade _____

Grades:		Attendance:		Discipline:	
1	_____	1	_____	1	_____
2	_____	2	_____	2	_____
3	_____	3	_____	3	_____

Date/Reason for Withdrawal _____

Activities:
- Student Interview _____
- Jr.-Sr. Conference _____
- Vocational Testing:
  - SPIB _____
  - WRIOT _____
  - McCarron Dials _____
  - GATB _____
- Planning Conference _____
- Sp. Ed. Interventions:
  1. _____
  2. _____
  3. _____
- In-depth Reviews:
  1. _____
  2. _____
  3. _____
- LST/ARD Actions _____
  _____

Parental Involvement:
- Parent Meetings _____
- Parent Handbook _____
- IEP Meeting _____
- Home Visit _____
- Parent Survey _____

Figure G-3. STUDENT NOTEBOOK